

United States Patent and Trademark Office

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/569,959	02/28/2006	Kazuhisa Mukai	MUKAI 3	3080
1444 7590 04/16/2007 BROWDY AND NEIMARK, P.L.L.C. 624 NINTH STREET, NW SUITE 300 WASHINGTON, DC 20001-5303		EXAMINER		
			RAGHU, GANAPATHIRAM	APATHIRAM
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			1652	
GUARTENER CTATITAR	A DEBIOD OF DESPONSE	MAIL DATE	DELIVER	V MODE
SHUKTENED STATUTOR	Y PERIOD OF RESPONSE	MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE	
· 31 D	DAYS	04/16/2007	PAPER	

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire 6 MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.

		Application No.	Applicant(s)		
Office Action Summary		10/569,959	MUKAI ET AL.		
		Examiner	Art Unit		
, ·		Ganapathirama Raghu	1652		
Period for I A SHOF WHICH - Extension after SIX - If NO pe - Failure to Any repl earned p	REPLY RETENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY EVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DA Ins of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.13 (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication. Initial for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period we or reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, by received by the Office later than three months after the mailing maternt term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).	(IS SET TO EXPIRE 1 MONTH() ATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION (6). In no event, however, may a reply be time till apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from cause the application to become ABANDONEI date of this communication, even if timely filed	S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, I. lely filed the mailing date of this communication. O (35 U.S.C. § 133).		
<u> </u>	•	action is non-final.			
, _	3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is				
•	closed in accordance with the practice under <i>Ex parte Quayle</i> , 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.				
Disposition			•		
4a 5)□ C 6)□ C 7)□ C	laim(s) 1-25 and 30-37 is/are pending in the and of the above claim(s) is/are withdraw laim(s) is/are allowed. laim(s) is/are rejected. laim(s) is/are objected to. laim(s) 1-25 and 30-37 are subject to restriction	vn from consideration.			
Application	n Papers		•		
10)□ Th A R	ne specification is objected to by the Examine ne drawing(s) filed on is/are: a) acception and request that any objection to the eplacement drawing sheet(s) including the correct ne oath or declaration is objected to by the Examine	epted or b) objected to by the lead of both or b) objected to by the lead in abeyance. See ion is required if the drawing(s) is objected to by	e 37 CFR 1.85(a). jected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).		
Priority un	der 35 U.S.C. § 119				
 12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f). a) All b) Some * c) None of: 1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received. 2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)). * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received. 					
2) Notice (3) Informa	of References Cited (PTO-892) of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) ation Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08) No(s)/Mail Date	4) Interview Summary Paper No(s)/Mail Do 5) Notice of Informal F 6) Other:	ate		

DETAILED ACTION

Claims 1-25 and 30-37 are pending.

Election/Restrictions

Restriction is required under 35 U.S.C. 121.

This application contains the following inventions or groups of inventions, which are not so linked as to form a single general inventive concept under PCT Rule 13.1. In accordance with 37 CFR 1.499, applicant is required, in reply to this action, to elect a single invention to which the claims must be restricted.

Group I: Claims 1, 25, 36 and 37 drawn to a cyclic maltosylmaltose.

Group II: Claims 2-9, drawn to a purified cyclic maltosylmaltose-forming enzyme.

Group III: Claim 10-18, drawn to a microorganism capable of producing a cyclic maltosylmaltose-forming enzyme and to an isolated DNA encoding a cyclic maltosylmaltoseforming enzyme, vector, host cell and the method of making the polypeptide.

Group IV: Claims 19-22, drawn to a process for producing cyclic maltosylmaltose-forming enzyme, comprising culturing a microorganism capable of producing said enzyme.

Group V: Claims 23-24 and 30-35, drawn to a process for producing cyclic maltosylmaltose.

The inventions listed as Groups I-V do not relate to a single general inventive concept under PCT Rule 13.1 because, under PCT Rule 13.2, they lack the same or corresponding special technical feature for the following reasons: The technical feature linking Groups I-V appears to be that they all relate to cyclic maltosylmaltose and compositions comprising cyclic maltosylmaltose (Group I: Claims 1, 25, 36 and 37). However, production of cyclic tetrasaccharide were known in the art. For example, Aga et al, (2002) teach the isolation of

Art Unit: 1652

branched derivatives of cyclictetrasaccharides (CTS), 4-O-α-D-glucopyranosyl-CTS and 3-O-α-isomaltosyl-CTS, which anticipates claims 1, 25, 36 and 37. Therefore Groups I-VII share no special technical feature as defined by PCT Rule 13.2, as it does not define a contribution over the prior art. Accordingly, Groups I-V are not so linked by the same or a corresponding special technical feature as to form a single general inventive concept.

Searching more than one of Groups I-V would represent a burden on the Office for the following reasons. Because the products of Groups I-III do not share a special structural and functional feature, a search for any one said product would not encompass a search for any other said products, for example the cyclic maltosylmaltose-forming enzyme could have been isolated by biochemical means as opposed to its production by recombinant methods and therefore a search for the polypeptide may not necessarily yield the DNA sequence encoding the polypeptide. Thus, a search for all of the products of Groups I-III would be a burden on the Office. A search of any one of the products of Groups I-III would not encompass a search of any of the methods of Groups IV-V, or vice versa, because said methods are not the only methods of making or using said products.

These inventions lack Unity of Invention for the reasons given above. Furthermore, each invention has acquired a separate status in the art due to their recognized divergent subject matter and, thus, searching more than one invention would be a burden on the Office. Therefore, restriction for examination purposes, as indicated, is proper.

Applicant is advised that the reply to this requirement to be complete must include an election of the invention to be examined even though the requirement be traversed (37 CFR 1.143).

Art Unit: 1652

Applicant is advised that the reply to this requirement to be complete must include an election of the invention to be examined even though the requirement be traversed (37 CFR 1.143).

Applicant is reminded that upon the cancellation of claims to a non-elected invention, the inventorship must be amended in compliance with 37 CFR 1.48(b) if one or more of the currently named inventors is no longer an inventor of at least one claim remaining in the application. Any amendment of inventorship must be accompanied by a request under 37 CFR 1.48(b) and by the fee required under 37 CFR 1.17(i).

Rejoinder of restricted inventions

The examiner has required restriction between product and process claims. Where applicant elects claims directed to the product, and a product claim is subsequently found allowable, withdrawn process claims that depend from or otherwise include all the limitation of the allowable product claim will be rejoined in accordance with the provisions of M.P.E.P. 821.04. Process claims that depend from or otherwise include all the limitation of the patentable product will be entered as a matter of right if the amendment is presented prior to final rejection or allowance, whichever is earlier. Amendments submitted after allowance are governed by 37 C.F.R. 1.312.

In the event of a rejoinder, the requirement for restriction between the product claims and the rejoined process claims will be withdrawn, and the rejoined process claims will be fully examined for patentability in accordance with 37 C.F.R. 1.104. thus, to be allowable, the rejoined claims must meet the criteria for patentability including the requirements of 35 U.S.C. 101, 102, 103 and 112. Until an elected product claim is found allowable, an otherwise proper restriction requirement between product claims and process claims may be maintained. Withdrawn process claims that are not commensurate in scope with an allowed product claim will not be rejoined. See "Guidance on Treatment of Product and Process Claims in light of In re Ochiai, In re Brouwer and 35 U.S.C. 103(b), 1184 O.G. 86 (March 26, 1996). Additionally, in order to retain the right to rejoinder in accordance with the above policy, Applicant is advised that process claims should be amended during prosecution either to maintain dependency on the product claims or otherwise include the limitation of the product claims. Failure to do so may result in a loss of the right to rejoinder. Further, note that the prohibition against double patenting rejections of 35 U.S.C. 121 does not apply where the restriction requirement is withdrawn by the examiner before the patent issues. See M.P.E.P. 804.01.

Art Unit: 1652

Final Comments

Applicant is reminded that upon the cancellation of claims to a non-elected invention, the inventorship must be amended in compliance with 37 CFR 1.48(b) if one or more of the currently named inventors is no longer an inventor of at least one claim remaining in the application. Any amendment of inventorship must be accompanied by a request under 37 CFR 1.48(b) and by the fee required under 37 CFR 1.17(i).

To insure that each document is properly filed in the electronic file wrapper, it is requested that each of amendments to the specification, amendments to the claims, Applicants' remarks, requests for extension of time, and any other distinct papers be submitted on separate pages.

It is also requested that Applicants identify support, within the original application, for any amendments to the claims and specification.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Ganapathirama Raghu whose telephone number is 571-272-4533. The examiner can normally be reached on 8 am - 4.30 pm EST. If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Ponnathapu Achutamurthy can be reached on 571-272-0928. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300 for regular communications and for After Final communications. Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of the application or proceeding should be directed to the receptionist whose telephone number is 571-272-1600.

Art Unit: 1652

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

Ganapathirama Raghu, Ph.D.
Patent Examiner
Art Unit 1652
April 09, 2007.

SHERIDAN SWOPE, PH.D.
PRIMARY EXAMINER